DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 996 RC 010 184

AUTHOR Davey, William G.; Chiavacci, Walter P.
TITLE Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the Southwest.
PUB DATE 24 Feb 77
NOTE 35p.; From the collected work, "The Current Status of Minorities in the Southwest" papers presented at the Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research (Chicago, Illinois, February 24-27, 1977). Related documents include RC 010 180-4 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; *Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Evaluation Criteria; Guidelines; Language of Instruction; Mexican Americans; *Non English Speaking; Program Content; Program Evaluation; *Spanish Speaking; Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Bicultural Education; *United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

Since the resurgence of bilingual schooling in the early sixties, the southwestern states have provided substantial leadership in facilitating the growth and development of cultural pluralism and bilingual education. Visible are two types of bilingual education programs: assimilation models which are designed to produce ethnic language shift, and pluralistic models which tend to foster native language and cultural maintenance while acquiring the second linguistic code and culture. Although the earliest bilingual programs in the Southwest were predominantly oriented to the Spanish speaking, current programs have diversified to include various Native American and Asian languages. As bilingual-bicultural programs grow, the need for increased supporting services, adequate teacher training, and effective program evaluation becomes critical. The paper reviews the incidences of bilingualism and lack of educational achievement of non-English minorities in the southwestern states and the steps taken to provide educational programs responsive to the needs of these students; gives a statement of definitions; and discusses the rationale, programs, structure, and implications of bilingual-bicultural education in the Southwest. Appended are guidelines for: Arizona's bilingual teachers; the professional preparation for the Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Specialist; the evaluation of individual teacher performance in a bilingual setting; the evaluation of bilingual programs in California. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William G. Davey
Walter P. Chiavacci
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED145996

RC010184

Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the Southwest

by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

William G. Davey
Walter P. Chiavacci
Department of Speech and Theatre
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

At the heart of current bilingual-bicultural education programs in the Southwest is instruction in culture and communication. Since the resurgence of bilingual schooling in the United States in the early sixties, the states in the Southwest have provided substantial leadership in facilitating the growth and development of cultural pluralism and bilingual education. The purpose of this paper is to review 1) the incidences of bilingualism and lack of educational achievement of non-English minorities in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas and 2) the steps taken in these states to provide educational programs responsive to the needs to non-English speaking students. The Southwest is unique in form, scope, and language communities served. What follows is a statement of definitions, rationale, programs, structure and implications of bilingual-bicultural education in the Southwest.

Definitions

Bilingual-bicultural education implies the use of a student's native language as an integral part of the educational process to teach the language of the dominant culture. According to the California State Department of Education, bilingual-bicultural education is "a process which uses two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction

From the collected work, "The Current Status of Minorities in the Southwest" papers presented at The Society for Intercultural Education, Training, and Research, Chicago, Illinois, 24-27 February 1977.

for the same pupil population in a well organized program which includes the study of the history and cultures associated with the mother tongues."[1]

While it is recognized that English-as-a-Second Language methodologies and programs have made a significant instructional impact in the education of non-English speaking students, the present analysis is restricted to only those programs employing multi-lingual methods.

Rationale

Any attempt at providing a rationale for bilingual-bicultural education in the Southwest requires an historical understanding of the problem. Research indicates that bilingual schooling was relatively diversified throughout the United States. In their comprehensive investigation, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Andersson and Boyer report that German and French were used as a medium of instruction as early as 1839. Beginning in 1843, Spanish was admitted as an instructional language in New Mexico.[2] By 1878, data in California indicates that over half the children enrolled in the state's schools came from homes in which English was not the dominant language.[3] The mandate of numbers required instruction in the mother tongue. While Mexican-American and Native American children still faced severe educational problems due to language and cultural differences during the first half of the twentieth century, the deemphasis of bilingual programs which occured in

the United States had a profound impact on education in the Southwest. Specific examples as well as general trends are shocking. In Guadalupe, Arizona, a town of 5,000 populated by Mexican-Americans, only thirty-eight of its students graduated from high school and none had graduated from college between 1910-1965.[4] Such lack of educational opportunity and achievement is common place along with international border between the U.S. and Mexico, but the tragic irony of Guadalupe is its location in metropolitan Phoenix, within five miles from Arizona State University and centered within the most progressive elementary and secondary school districts in Arizona. The recent educational trends among Mexican-Americans in the Southwest is equally alarming. In 1966, the median number of years completed by Mexican-Americans fourteen years old and over in the five Southwestern states was: Arizona 8.3; California 9.2; Colorado 8.7; New Mexico 8.8; and Texas 6.7. In many border counties the average was 5.7 years.[5]

Figures released by Senator Joseph Montoya of New Mexico further support traditional education's failure to educate Mexican-Americans. The percentage of Mexican-American males having no schooling ranges from 5.3% in Colorado to 16% in Texas. Spanish speaking persons 14 year and over in the Southwest average 3.9 years less schooling than whites and 1.6 years less than non-whites including both Blacks and Native-Americans. In every Southwestern state, the percentages of Mexican-Americans without an elementary school education are

substantially greater than the total population: Texas 64.7% versus 29.2%; Arizona 52.1% versus 27.7%; New Mexico 44.4% versus 23.1%; Colorado 29.9% versus 13.9% and California 37.4% versus 14.4%.[6] More recent figures reported by the United States Commission on Civil Rights suggest that "compared with the median number of 12.0 school years completed for whites, the median is 8.1 for Mexican Americans.[7]

As tragic as the Mexican American experience continues to be, the educational opportunity and achievement of Native Americans in the Southwest is equally as problematic.

Vice President Walter Mondale speaking before the Subcommittee on Indian Education characterized the federal Indian educational system as "probably. . .the worst system in the country."[8] So pervasive has been the lack of quality in Indian education, that Cohn and Hearne term the attitude of the Indian peoples as nothing short of warfare in their search for education.[9]

The litany of facts supporting the need for bilingual education for Native-Americans is as tragic as it is long. In 1966 over 16,000 school age Native Americans were not attending any type of school.[10] In 1969, nearly one third of the Navajo tribe, some 40,000, were functionally illiterate in English." The 1970 census indicates that approximately 31% of the 760,572 Native Americans surveyed speak an Indian language as their mother tongue.[13] The Southwest Indian Report graphically portrays the lack of enrollment, number of school years completed,

low achievement, high drop out rates, and the feelings of powerlessness experienced by Native Americans in education.[14] With dropout rates twice the national average, educational levels of Native Americans under Federal supervision under five years, and massive mismanagement of educational systems serving the Indian nations in the Southwest, a change in focus is clearly needed. Ms. Joy Hanley, the Director of Elementary Education for the Navajo's clearly summarized the problems facing both Native-Americans and Mexican Americans in the Southwest: "The public schools are still pretending that they are teaching children that have come out of middle class white homes. They don't realize that there is a cultural difference, that there is a language difference, and that there needs to be special programs to really teach the kinds of things they need to succeed in the society and to give the self-confidence."[15]

What was evolved on federal, state, and local levels to resolve the educational problem of non-English speaking minorities in the Southwest is the concept of Bilingual-Bicultural Education.

Programs

The incidences of bilingual education in the Southwest are not restricted only to recent years. In the 1920's several attempts at using Spanish as the medium of instruction were employed in Tucson (1923), San Antonio (1929), and Burbank, California (1931).[16] Due to vacillating federal attitudes, the frequency of Indian educational and language maintenance programs is substantially less than other minorities.

The major difference between earlier bilingual education projects and more recent ventures is the emphasis on cultural pluralism rather than assimilation.

Visible in the Southwest, as well as other parts of the United States, are essentially two types of bilingual education programs: assimilation and pluralistic. Assimilation models are designed to produce ethnic language shift. Pluralistic models tend to foster native language and cultural maintenance while acquiring the second linguistic code and culture.

Rolf Kjolseth distinguishes between the essential dimensions of assimilation and pluralistic models. In assimilation programs it is found that:

> (1) Because originated from 'above' by elites and administered in taken-for-granted, traditional ways by non-ethnic and supra-ethnic interests and forces, this program is likely to discourage ethnic community organization among the large majority and to stifle open appraisal of intra-and-inter-group conflicts.
> (2) The teacher exemplifies the ability of elite members of dominant cultures to master and propagate a 'superior' brand of ethnic culture and language.
> (3) The linguistic and cultural content of the assimilation program is metaphorically a 'vertically' articulated one implying power and hegemony. It emphasizes the superiority or inferiority of different varieties of language and culture and encourages restricting use to correct forms of school-approved varieties in all domains of usage. This may be successful in alienating the student from the ethnic language and culture of his home and community if there are few or no extra-school domains where the careful 'middle' class standard ethnic variety is appropriate. Pre-existent stereotypes on varieties of language and culture, their speakers and carriers held by youth and adults in both groups are unaltered or reinforced by these and other measures such as newspaper articles which describe the bilingual program as bringing 'cultural enrichment' and a literate standard language to the 'culturally deprived' and illiterate.[17]

Program evaluation is focused on the quality of individual performances within the school setting on a host of skill, aptitude and attitude measures - academic, linguistic, and psychological.[18]

The emphasis of the pluralistic model is on sociolinguistics and contains the following distinctive features:

> (1) This program acts as a continuing stimulus to civic development and organization within the ethnic community and encourages a democratic and more transparent forum for the resolution of conflicts and differing interests within and between the ethnic and non-ethnic communities.
> (2) The teaching personnel are, on ascriptive, achieved, and behavioral grounds credible exemplifications for ethnic and non-ethnic students and parents of successfully operative bilinguals and biculturals.
> (3) Paralleling the composition of administrative control with it egalitorian distribution of power among diverse community interest groups, the linguistic and cultural content of the pluralistic program might be characterized metaphorically as 'horizontally' articulated, emphasizing the complementarity of different varieites of situationally appropriate culture and language. This, along with an increased awareness of ethnolinguistics, encourages the student to become active in a variety of settings, use a number of linguistic varieties, and become experienced in switching between them. Language and cultural perspectives are added without progressively destroying his home language and culture. These developments take place in both groups.[19]

While these philosophical distinctions are useful for establishing a continuum that may be employed in identifying bilingual programs in the Southwest, it seems appropriate to suggest that most programs fall somewhere between the two extremes. In evaluating bilingual programs in 1969, Kjolseth argues that "the great majority of bilingual programs (well over 80%) highly approximate the extreme of the assimilation

model while the remaining few are only moderately pluralistic."[20]

A review of the bilingual programs in the five Southwestern states supports this contention. Those projects operating in 1969-70 which seem to have strong assimilationist tendencies include seven of eight programs in Arizona; eighteen of thirty projects in California; one of one in Colorado; five of seven in New Mexico and twenty-one of twenty-eight programs in Texas.[21]

The above comparison is not meant to be overly critical, but rather it is designed to acquaint the reader with the characteristics of bilingual schooling in the Southwest. Although it is generally agreed that pluralistic models of instruction are highly preferable, there seem to be several factors that preclude their general implementation in the Southwest. These include the high concentration of homogenious ethnic groups on reservation lands and near border areas, lack of materials, and a shortage of qualified bilingual- bicultural teachers. While these factors represent legitimate justification for non-pluralistic programs, the overwhelming assimilationist tendencies exhibited by Southwestern bilingual projects in the late sixties and early seventies prompted legislation promoting bicultural as well as bilingual education. Although the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968 made no specific provisions for involvement of English speaking students, some states revised local legislation to reflect the benefits of cultural pluralism.

As early as 1969, the New Mexico State Legislature passed statutes advocating intercultural interaction between English speaking and non-English speaking students.[22] In 1972, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 2284 which provided guidelines for establishing bilingual-bicultural education. According to Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction, the goal was to acknowledge bilingual education as the vehicle for meeting "the more urgent needs of the non-English speaking student, for providing bilingual educational opportunities for the monolingual English speaking child, and for promoting harmony between diverse cultural groups."[23] Although Texas mandated compulsory bilingual education in 1973, the emphasis of their programs continues to remain with Spanish speaking students.

Notwithstanding the Texas decision, the gradual trend toward pluralistic programs is represented by the 1973 enrollment figures in Title VII Bilingual Programs (see Table 1).

In 1974, the commitment to cultural pluralism was given added support when the revision of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act again provided for "The voluntary enrollment to a limited degree therein, on a regular basis, of children whose language is English, in order that they may acquire an understanding of the cultural heritage of the children of limited English speaking ability...." As a result of federal support and strong sentiments of Mexican-American and Native-American groups, legislation has been enacted or is pending in the five target states which reflects

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS

Table I	Participants						
Region and State	Dominant language		Total	Language of instruction			
	Non-English	English		Spanish	Native American	Other	Two or more languages**
U.S. TOTAL.....	74690	32271	106961	94057	3479	4651	4774
Southwest							
Arizona.....	1890	727	2617	2184	433	-	-
California*.....	11566	8738	20353	18014	-	670	1669
Colorado.....	966	1644	2610	2078	-	-	532
New Mexico.....	4449	532	4981	4430	361	-	190
Texas.....	33339	8369	41768	41768	-	-	-
Total.....	53265	20705	73970	68474	2435	670	2391

*There was one ESEA title VII project which did not respond.
**Multilingual projects involving two or more languages other than English, one of which is usually Spanish.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Bilingual Education Program. National Center for Education Statistics. NCES 76-314

local commitment to cultural pluralism.

With the availability of funding from federal, state, and local sources, the number of bilingual programs in the Southwest has dramatically increased. By the end of the 1975 school year, 185 Title VII programs were in operation in the five target states. Seventy-eight of these projects were in their initial year of funding. Table 2 summarizes the number of programs by state, funding year, and number of languages represented.

While the earliest bilingual programs in the Southwest were predominately oriented to the Spanish- speaking population, current programs have diversified to include a variety of Native-American and Asian languages. Table 3 summarizes this trend by state and language taught.

Although it is premature to evaluate the levels of achievement secured by the proliferation of bilingual-bicultural programs, the continuation of the current growth produces several important implications for the future.

Implications

As bilingual-bicultural programs grow, the need for increased supporting services, adequate teacher training, and effective program evaluation becomes critical. Data collection and analysis must be systematized to include reviews of state, local, and other federal programs. Data is currently being collected on state and local programs as well as the bilingual nature of some Project Follow Through programs. Until this data

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS

Table II

STATE	Number of projects	Funding Year of Project 1	2	3	4	5	6	Number of Languages of instruction in State's projects
ARIZONA.....	14	7			3	1	3	3
CALIFORNIA.....	86	42	1	7	5	16	15	7
COLORADO.....	9	3		2	2	2		3
NEW MEXICO.....	15	3		2	3	3	4	7
TEXAS.....	61	23		6	6	11	15	1

U.S. Office of Education. Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual Biclutural Programs, 1974-1975. Education Service Center, Region XIII. February 1975.

* * *

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS

Table III

Languages	STATE				
	ARIZONA	CALIFORNIA	COLORADO	NEW MEXICO	TEXAS
Acona.....				1	
Cantonese.....		5			
Japanese.....		2			
Keresan.....				1	
Mescalero Apache.				1	
Navajo.....	7		1	4	
Papago.....	2				
Pomo.....		1			
Portuguese.....		4			
Rueblo.....				1	
Spanish.....	8	82	9	9	60
Tagolog.....		3			
Ute.....			1		
Zuni.....				1	
Misc.....					1

U.S. Office of Education. Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual Biclutural Programs, 1974-1975. Education Service Center, Region XIII. February 1975.

can be usefully analyzed, the full impact of bilingual-bicultural education in the Southwest cannot be accurately determined.

In the interim, service projects in the Southwest such as, the Materials Acquisition Project in San Diego; the Dissemination Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education in Austin, Texas; The Multilingual Assessment Program in Stockton, California; and the Southwest Regional Adaptation Center in San Antonio, Texas, provide regional and national leadership in research and dissemination of information. In addition, numerous state and local educational agencies are developing and refining instructional materials and assessment tools.

State Departments of Education are revising credential requirements to include proficiency in two target languages, substantial instruction in both minority and dominant cultures, and competence in linguistics and educational methods. Presently, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, and New Mexico have a bilingual teacher endorsement to the elementary or secondary credential. Requirements are typical of those listed in Appendix A. Under Ryan Act guidelines, California has implemented a comprehensive Bilingual-Crosscultural Specialist credential (see Appendix B) and is proposing the creation of a Bilingual Teacher endorsement to the standard credentials. While programs exist to train teachers, the critical shortage of qualified bilingual-bicultural teachers is expected to continue well into the 1980's. Samuel B. Ethridge of the National Education

Association, speaking in Albuquerque in 1973 estimated at that time 84,500 more Spanish-speaking teachers and 7,400 more Native American teachers were needed to meet minimal national needs.[25] The shortage can be illustrated most vividly citing 1974 figures from California where 2,000 bilingual teachers were needed, and only 231 were enrolled in approved Bilingual-Crosscultural Specialist credential programs.[26] This deficit was expected to increase to 10,000 by 1980. Trends in other Southwestern state indicate the necessity for expanded in-service training programs operated by local projects.

In addition to expanded teacher training, the growth of bilingual-bicultural programs demands the refinement of and program evaluation tools. Appendix C suggests a comprehensive format for evaluating teacher performance in a bilingual setting. Appendix D suggests program evaluation criteria. Both are the results of the Bilingual-Bicultural Taskforce in California. Continued development of evaluation tools is essential on all levels of operation.

In a nation of growing minority self-awareness, the need for communication between and among ethnic groups is critical. It appears that bilingual-bicultural education can serve to facilitate cooperation among the peoples of the Southwest. This paper has attempted to illustrate trends in five states. It does not represent a comprehensive review, but rather represents a statement of purpose, committment, and application of bilingual-bicultural education in the Southwest.

Footnotes

[1]Bilingual-Bicultural Education and English-as-a Second Language Education: A Framework for Elementary and Secondary Schools (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1974), p. 5.

[2]Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Vol.1 (Austin Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1970), p. 17.

[3]Bilingual-Bicultural Education, p. iii.

[4]Ernesto Galarza, Herman Gallegos, Julian Samora, Mexican Americans in the Southwest (Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1970), p. 39.

[5]Galarza, p. 38.

[6]Senator Joseph Montoya, Hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization (June 11-12, 1969).

[7]U.S. Civil Rights Commission, A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1975),p. 17.

[8]U.S. Senate, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 91st Congress, 1st Session, pt.1, 2-3, 1969.

[9]For a brief discussion of the Indian Education problem, see Edgar S. Cohn and David W. Hearne, eds., Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America (New York: A New Community Press Book,1969).

[10]Cahn and Hearne, p.28.

[11]Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Indian Education: A National Tragedy-A National Challenge, Report No. 91-501, Nov. 1969, 91st Congress, 1st Sess., p xii.

[12]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1970 Census of Population: Subject Reports--American Indians, Table 18.

[13]A Better Chance to Learn, p. 13.

[14]US Commission on Civil Rights, The Southwest Indian Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1973), pp. 23-9.

[15]Ms. Joy Hanley quoted in The Southwest Indian Report, p.26.

[16]U.S. Department of th Interior, The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Five Soutwestern States (Washington,D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933).

[17]Rolf Kjolseth, "Bilingual Education Programs in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism?," in Paul R. Turner, ed., Bilingualism in the Southwest (Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1973), pp. 14-15.

[18]ibid, p. 14.

[19]ibid, pp. 10-11.

[20]ibid, pp. 15-16.

[21]Programs reviewed in this analysis are listed as operating by Andersson and Boyer in 1969-70. These figures are not meant to indicate a comprehensive review of all bilingual programs in the Southwest, but rather to indicate the existence of a trend.

[22]For a discussion of the legislation and program problems in New Mexico, see Henry W. Pascual, Bilingual Education for New Mexico Schools (Santa Fe: State Department of Education,1973).

[23]Wilson Riles quoted in Bilingual-Bicultural Education-A Framework, p.iv.

[24]Bilingual Education Act of 1974, Section 703B.

[25]Samuel B. Ethridge quoted in A Better Chance to Learn,p93.

[26]The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Status Report on The Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Teacher Preparation and Training Act of 1973 for the California State Legislature, January 10, 1975, p 8.

Appendix A

Bilingual Teacher Guidelines - Arizona

The bilingual teacher certification in Arizona is an endorsement on a valid elementary or secondary teaching credential. Requirements are as follows:

A. Valid elementary or secondary teaching certificate.

B. Completion of an approved program at an Arizona college or university, OR

C. Completion of an equivalent program to include evidence of competence in the following areas with a minimum of fifteen (15) semester hours in the culture and methodology areas:

   1. Culture: fundamental aspects of ethnic group cultures; survey of commonalities and differences of the major aspects of cultures, including history, language, fine arts, and social sciences.

   2. Methodology: the classroom methodology taught shall be related to the teaching major; a related multicultural field experience.

D. Language:

   1. Proficiency in the second language must be verified by the language department of a regionally or nationally accredited institution.

   2. Proficiency in English as a second language must be verified by the language department of a regionally or nationally accredited institution

Source: Arizona Department of Education, Arizona Rules and Regulations Governing the Certification of Teachers and Administrators in Arizona, 8.02 05.

Appendix B

Professional Preparation Guidelines
For
The Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Specialist Credential

1.0 Professional Competence Requirements

The following implementation statements are guidelines to assist educational institutions in developing approved programs for the preparation of the Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Specialist. The implementation statement shall not be regarded as rigidly controlling, since diversity in approved programs is desirable and to be encouraged. Each institution shall develop and clearly indicate the competencies and mastery level required in its approved program.

Diversity of program can be achieved by a concerted effort on the part of institutions of higher education to work closely with the target population community based groups and professional organizations in the program development, evaluation of educational needs, programs, and Specialist standards.

1.1 The institution shall provide for a core professional preparation program which will develop understanding and demonstrable competencies in candidates. Each program shall have clearly stated goals and objectives with specification of performance criteria, levels of performance accepted and state the means by which to achieve them.

The following factors shall be included in the professional preparation program submitted for Commission approval. The program objectives shall define in verifiable terms the skills and competencies to be developed and state the experiences provided in which to demonstrate them.

Major competencies and knowledge shall be developed in but not limited to:

1.1.1 Culture

Contemporary life style of the target population (their current life-style in the United States).

Target population's mother culture(s).

1.1.2 Bilingual and/or Cross-Cultural Teaching Techniques

Bilingual teaching strategies

Team teaching with the paraprofessional

Performance based teaching

English as a Second (E.S.L.) Language technique

Target Population Language as a second language technique

Bilingual and/or Cross-Cultural teaching materials development techniques

Teaching the bilingual and/or bicultural child

The teaching of reading in the target language

1.1.3 Target Language Competencies

-Communication Level

Oral Comprehension

Aural Comprehension

Reading

Writing

-Component Level

Speaking

Writing

-Linguistics

Current

Historical

To evaluate proficiency in the competencies and knowledge cited above, the candidate needs to demonstrate minimum levels of performance acceptable.

The program shall include but not be limited to the performance criteria stated in the adopted specialist guidelines.

2.0 Field Work Requirements

2.1 The institution shall provide the candidate field work experiences which is to receive the major emphasis in the professional preparation program, and shall provide for intensive, thorough, realistic experience with continuous and varied responsibilities in the school with the emphasis on bilingual/cross-cultural classroom instruction.

2.1.1 A broad range of experiences in the target population's community and schools shall provide contact with students at school, in their community, teachers, field supervisors, school administrators and community personnel in a variety of settings.

2.1.2 Indication in specific terms of how each offering in professional preparation will contribute effectively to the experience, performance, and excellence of the candidates.

2.1.3 Provision for the administration and monitoring of the entire professional preparation program.

2.2 The institution shall provide for the cooperation and coordination of all who are participants in the preparation of candidates.

2.2.1 Careful screening in the selection of master teachers and candidate's field work supervisors.

2.2.2 Provisions for continual improvement of the institution's staff and the improvement of the cooperating teachers in school districts.

2.2.3 Cooperation and coordination between college supervisors, master teachers, and candidates.

3.0 Institutional Requirements

3.1 The institution shall ensure cooperation and coordination of all those who are participants in the preparation of candidates.

3.1.1 Evidence of broad institutional involvement in and a commitment to program development.

3.1.2 Cooperating target population communities, school districts, teachers, and candidates, carefully selected, involved in, and committed to program development.

3.2 The institution shall provide the human and material resources needed to carry out the bilingual/cross-cultural education specialist program.

3.2.1 Assessment and assignment of appropriate institutional resources to various aspects of the preparation program.

3.2.2 Assessment and utilization of appropriate target population community resources.

3.3 The institution shall provide for the candidate to meet the specific subject matter knowledge requirements for the bilingual/cross-cultural specialist credential.

3.3.1 Course content related to subjects commonly taught in the public schools, as specified in the statutes and described in the curriculum frameworks adopted by the California State Board of Education.

3.4 The institution shall provide that candidate selection and evaluation be a significant part of the total program.

3.4.1 Requirements for candidates' admission to the program of specialist preparation based on a broad index, including:

Academic achievement

Interview

Written recommendations

Prior experience with children and youth groups from the target population.

3.4.2 Provisions for a systematic evaluation, counseling, and advising program for candidates admitted to the teacher education programs.

3.4.3 Specific criteria listed for continuance of teacher candidates in the program, including but not limited to:

Character and other personal attributes, e.g., positive attitude, personal fitness, human responsiveness.

3.4.4 Provisions for final review and evaluation of candidates upon completion of program and prior to recommendation of candidates for credential. Criteria to include, but not be limited to:

No candidate shall be recommended for credentialing unless he has demonstrated competence in the target language in oral, aural, reading and writing comprehension.

3.4.5 Provisions for evaluation of graduates after initial employment.

3.4.6 Provisions for evaluation and improvement of the total professional preparation program on the basis of candidates' and graduates' performance.

Source: The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Status Report on The Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Teacher Preparation and Training Act of 1973 for The California State Legislature, January 10, 1975, pp.20-24.

Appendix C

Evaluation of Individual Teacher Performance
in a Bilingual Setting

Each of the following items are evaluated on a rating scale including: 1(never); 2(rarely); 3(sometimes); 4(frequently); 5(always); and 6(did not observe.)

1.0 Management of teacher/student cognitive behavior

1.1 The teacher is able to create objectives and topics and issues which stimulate a verbal interaction between pupils and teacher.

1.1.1 Majority of students participate in discussion with the teacher.

1.1.2 Discussion topics are explored which have relevance to cultural context of the students

1.2 The teacher can use inquiry techniques which evoke pupil responses within the framework of the instructional objectives of the lesson and the language competency of the student.

1.2.1 Uses questions as part of teaching strategy in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.2.2 Provides all students with an equal opportunity to respond to questions in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.2.3 Uses questions that encourage and promote pupil discovery and experimentation,

1.3 The teacher can utilize techniques which develop language skills and which require higher levels of thinking than recall.

1.3.1 Questions elicit responses in phrases or full sentences.

1.3.2 Questions elicit responses which require full explanations.

1.3.3 Questions develop responses which define and lead to discovery of solutions in problematic areas.

1.3.4 Questions require responses that draw on the experience and background of the student.

1.4 The teacher uses a variety of reinforcing techniques to pupil responses.

1.4.1 Attentively listens to student responses.

1.4.2 Uses comments in answer to student responses that keep discussion opened. (Ex: avoids yes-no, right-wrong responses to pupils.)

1.4.3 Responds in language appropriate to language skill level of student in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.4.4 Student interest in topic being discussed is maintained through teacher encouragement.

1.4.5 Changes strategy and/or language when the desired student response is not being developed.

1.4.6 Accepts responses which reflect divergent thinking and acknowledges their value.

1.4.7 Accepts, values, and encourages students responses showing a variety of vocabulary and language forms.

1.5 The teacher's verbal behavior indicates clear thinking, command, and acceptance of appropriate languages.

1.5.1 Assignments and directions are stated clearly and concisely in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.5.2 Responses to student questions are direct and to the point in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.5.3 Restates a given concept using different vocabulary language and/or examples to clarify the idea in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

1.5.4 Chooses language appropriate for pupil and type of teacher/pupil interaction.

1.5.5 Respects both English and language of the pupil by using both languages and avoiding verbal responses which devalue and inhibit the use of either language.

2.0 Management of program development

2.1 The teacher can define instructional objectives which are stated in terms of pupil behavior and reflect relevant needs of the pupil.

2.1.1 Objectives clearly indicate the type of terminal behavior that is expected.

2.1.2 Objectives are shared with pupils.

2.1.3 Objectives are understood by pupils.

2.1.4 Objectives reflect cooperative development by teacher and pupils.

2.1.5 Behavior stated in objective is measureable in terms of the initial behavior of the students and their ability to advance to the level of behavior indicated.

2.1.6 Behavior stated in objective is of sufficiently high ceiling to encourage pupil growth and the development of teaching possibilities.

2.2 The teacher uses appropriate methods and materials to implement instructional objectives.

2.2.1 Teaching strategies are selected which are effective and relevant for the situation, the ability level, language proficiency and cultural background of the student.

2.2.2 The design of teaching strategies demonstrates knowledge of the intellectual, emotional and sociological development of the students.

2.2.3 Teaching strategies show a diversity of techniques depending on multiple sources of information in:

Curriculum content
Second language acquisition
Cultural content

2.2.4 Uses audio visual machines and materials to promote effective learning.

2.2.5 Develops bilingual/bicultural materials appropriate to the language experience, cultural and intellectual abilities of the students.

2.2.6 Sets up room environment which encourages learning and stimulates discovery and creativity.

2.3 The teacher assesses pupil's achievement as defined by behavioral objectives both formally and informally.

2.3.1 Evaluation is consistent with behavioral objectives.

2.3.2 Evaluation program provides for student and parent perception of student growth.

2.3.3 Written tests in form and difficulty are appropriate to student achievement level, objectives and language proficiency in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

2.3.4 Pupil progress is measured by means other than written tests, such as verbal interaction in appropriate language and observation.

2.3.5 Pupil progress is interpreted to students in meaningful manner which directs attention to areas of strengths and areas where improvement is needed.

2.4 The teacher shows evidence of continually evaluating and improving teaching programs.

2.4.1 Uses evaluation results to direct immediate planning of teaching strategy.

2.4.2 Uses evaluation to reject, revise or maintain teaching strategies.

2.4.3 Uses students and parents as resources in planning and modifying teaching program.

2.4.4 Seeks new ideas to improve classroom teaching in bilingual/bicultural setting.

2.5 The teacher can diagnose the learning problems of students and prescribe individualized instruction to meet the needs of individual pupils.

2.5.1 Uses appropriate instruments and methods both formally and informally to diagnose individual and group learning problems.

2.5.2 Knows when and to whom to refer problems needing a specialist.

2.5.3 Can develop a plan of prescribed activities to alleviate the learning problems of individual students.

2.5.4 Can implement a strategy for program of individualized instruction focused on the needs of individual students in the class.

3.0 Management of teacher/student effective behavior

3.1 The teacher indicates he is sensitive to the responses from pupils.

3.1.1 Uses verbal cues (words, phrases, comments, questions) to encourage responses from students in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

3.1.2 Uses nonverbal cues (gestures, facial expression, body movements) to encourage pupil response.

3.2 The teacher assists the pupils in handling problem areas in a more sensitive manner.

3.2.1 Uses verbal encouragement to stimulate student awareness and sensitivity to problems.

3.2.2 Uses nonverbal encouragement to stimulate student awareness and sensitivity to problems.

3.3 The teacher's behavior reflects an awareness of and respect for different cultural values.

3.3.1 Verbally gives clues of recognizing and accepting differentiating social, religious and cultural values.

3.3.2 Nonverbally gives clues of being aware of differentiating social, religious and cultural values.

3.3.3 Is accepting of values other than those held by himself.

3.3.4 Allows expression of different values and behaviors without being critical of or suppressing any particular value system.

4.0 Development of professional competencies

4.1 The teacher can describe his role as a bilingual/bicultural teacher and function consistently within that role. Through his classroom experience he can modify his role as necessary to meet the needs of the students and the community.

4.1.1 Teacher evaluates and modifies teaching style to attain goals of bilingual/bicultural education.

4.1.2 Modifies or adopts a teaching role which is the result of self evaluation.

4.1.3 Has attempted to meet and exceed goals of professional and legal requirements and responsibilities. (Ex: home visits, referral of parents to helping agencies, develops new courses, materials.)

4.2 The teacher continues the development of his skills and competencies as a bilingual/bicultural teacher.

4.2.1 Seeks new ideas from others to improve teaching performance and shows evidence of experimenting with new procedures and materials based on a careful examination of ideas from outside sources.

4.2.2 Has own professional plan of study that relates current research and practice to classroom practices.

4.2.3 Shows evidence of reading professional journals, attending professional meetings and participating in professional discussions and in-service education related to bilingual/bicultural education.

4.3 The teacher can effectively communicate relevant data and ideas to parents, school administrators and colleagues.

4.3.1 Can clearly describe the school program to parents and community through written and oral statements to parents in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

4.3.2 Can effectively conduct a parent conference in:

English
Language of the home
Formal/academic version of home language

4.3.3 Takes advantage of opportunities to participate in decision making which affects instruction, curriculum, and learning.

4.3.4 Works constructively with others in modifying and implementing programs for the improvement of the bilingual/bicultural school learning environment.

4.3.4.1 Administrators
4.3.4.2 Supervisors
4.3.4.3 Community

4.3.5 Works cooperatively with and considers the viewpoint of other colleagues.

4.3.6 Works cooperatively with paraprofessional and school support personnel in the classroom.

4.3.6.1 Enlists their aid in planning.
4.3.6.2 Develops paraprofessional skills.
4.3.6.3 Assigns meaningful tasks.

4.4 The teacher can work effectively in the community and employ its resources in enriching the school environment.

4.4.1 Participates in meetings of parent groups and other community organizations.

4.4.2 Works with and uses the resources and services of agencies of the community to which students and their families can be referred for needed assistance.

4.4.3 Is aware, works with, and reinforces the cultural resource of the community to enrich the learning experience.

4.4.4 Consistently seeks the cooperation of community residents to provide assistance in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the bilingual/bicultural program.

4.5 The teacher can function effectively in both the dominant and minority culture.

4.5.1 Develops language proficiency in both the home language and formal/academic language of the home.

4.5.2 Knows the origins, history and present forms of the culture of the target population.

4.5.3 Knows the origins, history and present forms of the culture of the dominant populations.

4.5.4 Participates in present forms of cultural activities in the community.

4.5.5 Can analyze the causes of cross cultural conflict and design strategies to relieve these tensions in the school setting.

Source: NCIES/BILTI/1972

Appendix D

Bilingual Program Evaluation Criteria - California

The process of evaluation includes reporting the results of periodic assessment as well as evaluating all available data. Before evaluation can begin, a precise definition of what is to be evaluated, how the evaluation will be accomplished, and a schedule of carrying out the evaluation process must be established. Just as the program design was based on the results of a needs assessment, the evaluation plan should include all of the elements of the program. In this way, each element can be judged as to how well it is meeting the needs that were identified by the needs assessment. Successes and failures can be assessed, and changes or improvements in the program can be made as a result of the evaluation process.

The cycle of needs assessment, program design, implementation, and evaluation is continuous. Throughout the school year, an assessment of results of each part of the program is made, and these data are used in periodic evaluation which may come at the end of a given course of instruction or other time period, such as semester or school year. The determination as to when evaluation occurs is based upon experience, but both periodic evaluation and continuous assessment are essential to an effective evaluation procedure. Evaluation at the end of a semester or school year provides a means for judging the overall effectiveness of a program, while periodic checks and continuous assessment provide the bases for making program changes.

The principal areas towards which evaluation should be directed are pupil growth and development, program design, parent involvement, and staffing. All of these areas are interrelated and together make up the total program. In the evaluation of each element, it is important to keep in mind the contributions of the other program components. By sorting out the part each component has played in a particular program activity, the chances of evaluating that component's effectiveness in the overall success or failure of the activity are increased. Evaluation of this type will allow the improvement or addition of the participation of those program components that contribute to the achievement of program goals and objectives.

Areas of Concern for Assessment and Evaluation

Each of the major program components should be considered in the overall evaluation plan. In the outline that follows, the areas of concern for assessment and evaluation are listed for each of the major program components; suggested evaluation instruments that may be used to gather data follow this list of areas of concern:

1. Pupil Growth and Development

    a. Academic achievement (Language proficiency in both home and second languages)
    b. Concept development (Understandings and knowledge in all subject matter taught)

c. Attitudinal growth
   (1) Affective areas of positive self-image and pride in heritage
   (2) Positive attitudes toward other cultures and groups
d. Skills and behaviors (Academic skills, such as handwriting; and social skills, such as leadership and group participation)

2. Program Design

a. Total curriculum (Appropriateness to pupils, including school organizational patterns, methods, techniques, and materials)
b. Staffing (Adequate numbers to carry out program design: specific abilities or skills such as team teaching, differentiated staffing, and so forth)
c. Parent involvement (Adequate provision in design to include parent involvement in all areas of the program, including planning, operation, parent education, and evaluation)
d. Long-range and short-range goals
   (1) Provides for meeting both broad goals and specific objectives
   (2) Provides time line and sequence of activities
   (3) Includes provision for explaining program to pupils, staff, and parents
   (4) Includes means of incorporating program modifications suggested by staff and pupils
e. Curriculum materials
   (1) Appropriateness to pupils, including grade level and mental maturity
   (2) Appropriate to pupil learning styles
   (3) Acceptable or relevent to student's culture and heritage
   (4) Appropriate to methods and techniques of teaching suggested by program design
   (5) Recognition and utilization of community resources
   (6) Acceptable to community at large

3. Parent Involvement

a. Positive contributions to student achievement; positive contributions to student's cultural awareness
b. Participation in staff recruitment and selection
c. Assisting staff as paraprofessionals
d. Participation in preservice and inservice training
e. Participation in setting goals and objectives of program
f. Participation in curriculum development and selection of curriculum materials
g. Knowledge and understanding of program objectives and school and program operation
h. Attitudinal changes toward other cultures and ethnic groups

4. Staffing (Certificated staff, paraprofessionals, volunteers, and so forth)

a. Positive contributions to student achievement
b. Interaction between staff and pupil
c. Awareness and acceptance of the culture and history of the student's community

d. Extent to which staff implements program goals and objectives
e. Positive contribution to student's self-image and awareness of cultural heritage
f. Contribution to development of pupil skills and behaviors (See Stull Bill.)

Suggested Means for Evaluation

In the following outline suggested means (including instruments) of evaluation are identified for four major program components:

1. Pupil Growth and Development

   a. Academic achievement in language proficiency
      (1) Teacher observation
      (2) Locally and nationally developed language-proficiency instruments-reading and writing
      (3) Pre/post-testing; criterion-referenced testing
      (4) Success in the regular testing program of the school
      (5) Degree to which pupil is keeping pace with the regular instructional program
      (6) Parent conferences to establish whether pupil is using the new language at home and whether parents feel that their child is continuing in his cognitive growth
      (7) Pupil's willingness to utilize the language being learned
   b. Attitudinal growth (development of positive self-image)
      (1) Behavior at school
         (a) Pre/post-test (attitudinal)
         (b) General teacher observations regarding pupil's feelings of self-acceptance and of self-confidence; pupil's willingness to take the initiative; pupil's need to upgrade self-image
      (2) Behavior at home
         (a) Parent conference
         (b) Home visits, or other appropriate means
   c. Cultural awareness (oral and written)
      (1) Demonstration by students of awareness of the values inherent in both their dominant and other cultures
      (2) Demonstration by students of ability to use the appropriate social skills of the two cultures
      (3) Demonstration by students of their understanding of their heritage and culture and their awareness of their contributions to the dominant English-speaking society.

2. Program Evaluation Procedures

   a. Program design
      (1) Appropriateness to pupils; results of surveys (oral or written in both languages) of parents, teachers, and pupils; measurable achievement report cards, progress reports, test scores, observations
         (a) School organizational patterns: checklist to be filled out by teachers, parents, and pupils; surveys
         (b) Classroom organizational patterns: questionnaire to teachers, parents, students; periodic, written reports from teachers; observations

(c) Methods and techniques-teacher lesson plans; observations; checklists to be filled out by teachers, parents, and pupils

(2) Staffing to meet objectives-number of bilingual teachers; amount of teacher preparation; inservice and preservice training; surveys of parents, teachers, and students

(3) Parent involvement to meet objectives-periodic reports from advisory committee; questionnaires to teachers, parents, and pupils

b. Curriculum and curriculum materials

(1) Appropriateness to pupils' age and grade levels and learning styles; acceptability to pupils; appropriateness to pupils' cultural heritage

(a) Preview and written evaluation of materials

(b) Survey of parents, students, and teachers regarding materials

(2) Appropriateness to teaching styles, methods, and techniques

(a) Survey of parents, teachers, and students in both languages

(b) Review of lesson plans

(3) Recognition and utilization of community resources-questionnaire to parents, teachers, and pupils

3. Parent Involvement

a. Positive contributions to student achievement and cultural awareness-survey of teachers, parents, and pupils

b. Participation in selection and recruitment of staff, participation in setting goals and objectives of the program; participation in curriculum development and curriculum materials selection; assessment of participation in all areas of the program

(1) Records of attendance

(2) Narrative and written reports by teachers, pupils, and parents

c. Participation as paraprofessionals: participation in preservice and inservice training

(1) Record of number of paraprofessionals on staff

(2) Record of attendance at preservice and inservice training meetings.

(3) Lesson plans or meeting schedules to check actual participation by paraprofessionals

d. Measuring knowledge of the learning process and the operation of the school system--questionnaire to parents

4. Staffing

a. Teachers and paraprofessionals in relation to positive contributions to pupil achievement

(1) Lesson plans

(2) Observation

(3) Pupil Success

b. Effectiveness of teacher-pupil interaction-observation

c. Effectiveness of teacher-paraprofessional interaction--questionnaire

d. Effectiveness of staff-parent interaction--questionnaire

Source: California State Department of Education, Bilingual- Bicultural Education and English-as-a- Second Language Education (Sacramento: Bureau of Publications, 1974), pp. 26-31.

Appendix E

Bibliography

Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the Southwest

Anderson,T. and M.Boyer. Bilingual Schoolong in the U.S. Austin. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. January. 1970

Arizona Department of Education. Arizona Rules and Regulation governing the Certification of Teacher and Administrators in Arizona. 1975

Arizona Department of Education. Arizona's Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1975. P.L. 89-10 Educational Programs for Migrant Children. ESEA 1965

Arizona Department of Education. Migrant Child Education Administrative Handbook. Compensatory Education Unit.

Arizona. State Plan for the Education of Migratory Children Fiscal year 1976. Division of Migrant Child Education. June 1975

Bankd. James. and Joyce William. ed. Teaching the Language Arts to Culturally Different Children. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1971

California State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Education and the Mexican American Community in Los Angeles County. April 1968

California State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. State Administration of Bilingual Education-SI O NO?. June 1976

California State Department of Education. Bilingual-Bicultural Education and English-as-a-second Language. A Framework for Elementary and Secondary School. July 1973.

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Status Report on the Bilingual/Cross-cultural Teacher Preparation and Training Act of 1973 for the California State Legislature. January 1975.

Dissemination Center for Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs, 1974-1975. Austin: E.S.E.A. Title VII Project. February 1975.

Galarza, E. H. Gallegos, and J. Samora. Mexican-American in the Southwest. Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1969.

Gomez, Donna. English/Vietnanese Bilingual Program. Chuong Trinh Anh-Viet Ngu. San Diego: City Schools. January 1976

Hazard, W.R., H.N. Rivlin and M.D. Stent. Cultural Pluralisn in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Meredith Corp. 1973.

Leon, Shirley. The Bilingual School. Part I and II. Children's House

Leon, Shirley. Bilingual Education is sweeping the Nation. Views on Bilingual Education from various areas of the U.S. Children House.

Materiale Acquisition Project. Materiales en Marcha. San Diego: Parallel Curricula in Spanish and Portuguese. Various volumes.

Moore, Joan ed. Mexican Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1970.

Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center. Amendments to A Project for in-service Training of Teachers in the Navajo Area.

Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center on Behalf of the Leupp Community School Board. Navajo Involvement in Education Design. Title III, Public Law 89-10

Turner, Paul R. ed. Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. 1973.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. May 1975

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican American Education in Texas: A function of Wealth. Report IV, Aug. 1972.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican American Education Study. May 1971.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Vol. 1. 1967.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Excluded Student: Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Report III. May 1972.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Parmington Report: A Conflict of Cultures. New Mexicao Advisory Committee. July 1975.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Unfinished Education. Mexican American Educational Series. Report 11. Oct. 1971.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI. Feb. 1974.

U.S. Department of Health, Education,and Welfare. A Guide to Follow Through. Prepared by Edward J. Cherian and Ass. Inc. Washington. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Bilingual Education Program. NCES 76-314. 1972-1973 Regular and 1973 summer school Term.

Valley National Bank of Arizona. Arizona Statistical Review. 31st. Annual Edition. Economic Research Department . Sept. 1975